

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated October 5, 2004, claims 9, 11, 15 and 20 have been amended. Claims 9-20 are in the case. The Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the present application.

The Office Action objected to claims 11-14 due to minor informalities.

The Applicants have amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner to overcome this objection.

The Office Action rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Teynor (U.S. Patent No. 5,305,183) in view of Batra (U.S. Patent No. 6,588,869). The Office Action rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Teynor in view of Batra and further in view of Negatu (U.S. Patent No. 6,454,476). The Office Action rejected claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Teynor in view of Batra and as applied to claim 11 and further in view of Olson (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,338). The Office Action rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Teynor in view of Batra, Negatu and Olson as applied to claims 12 and 13 and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent No. 5,651,625). The Office Action rejected claims 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Teynor in view of Olson. The Office Action rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Teynor in view of Olson as applied to claims 15-18 and further in view of Smith. Last, the Office Action rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Teynor in view of Batra and Olson.

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

Specifically, any combination of the cited references does not disclose all of the Applicants' claimed features. For example, any combination does not disclose the Applicants' internal electronic components of a printer that are physically positioned adjacent to an access area of a set-top box with second internal electronic components, wherein the first and second internal electronic components are electrically shared and physically integrated with each other without a cable connection. Accordingly, since at least one element is missing from the combined references, they **cannot** render the claims

Attorney Docket No.: 109900385-2


obvious due to a lack of a prima facie case of obviousness. (MPEP 2143).

With regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, they are therefore patentable on the same basis. (MPEP § 2143.03).

Thus, it is respectfully requested that the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly request the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney at (818) 885-1575. Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to:

Hewlett Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,  
Dated: December 30, 2004



---

Edmond A. DeFrank  
Reg. No. 37,814  
Attorney for Applicant